



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/643,584	08/22/2000	Eric Schneider		9982

24226 7590 07/30/2004
ERIC SCHNEIDER
13944 CEDAR ROAD
258
UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS, OH 44118

EXAMINER

TRAN, PHILIP B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2155

DATE MAILED: 07/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/643,584

Applicant(s)

SCHNEIDER ET AL.

Examiner

Philip B Tran

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 21-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date Z.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. Claims 21-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al (Hereafter, Smith), U.S. Pat. No. 6,578,078 in view of Ong, U.S. Pat. Application Pub. No. US 2002/0156800 A2.

Regarding claim 21, Smith teaches a method comprising :

receiving, at a server, a request to locate a file from said server wherein said request includes a Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) (= the server receives a message

from a client requesting a resource via its URL reference) [see Col. 11, Lines 57-61];
and

determining that said file cannot be located on said server (= determining if URL has been redirected) [see Fig. 4 and Col. 15, Lines 25-30].

Smith does not explicitly teach extracting at least one keyword from at least one non-query URI component of said URI, generating a search engine request to search web page content from said at least one keyword, and providing results of said search engine request. However, Smith does suggest browsing a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) and extracting URL and determining if the URL is accessible by not having been redirected then accessing the new URL and displaying the page in reference to updated URL [see Smith, Fig. 4 and Col. 15, Lines 24-27 and Col. 15, Lines 52-60 and Col. 13, Line 25 – Col. 14, Line 7 and Col. 15, Lines 24-60]. This implies that the URL should be parsed and the new URL is generated and provided for querying the requested resource.

Ong, in the same field of locating resource on the Internet by processing Uniform Resource Locator (URL), discloses extracting the time-stamp (keyword), retrieving the appropriate Web page corresponding to the time-stamp and returning appropriate page to the client [see Abstract and Paragraph [0008] on Page 1]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate implementation of extracting keyword from URL and generating a search engine request to search web page content from corresponding keyword and providing results of search engine request, disclosed by Ong, into the system of searching resource on

the Internet using URL request disclosed by Smith, in order to locate the resource in an efficient manner when the requested content cannot be found on the server corresponding to the URL.

Regarding claim 22, Smith further teaches said request is a HTTP request and said determining that said file cannot be located on said server includes receiving an error code in response to performing said HTTP request (i.e., "Document/Page not Found" error when a web page has been moved and the prior URL is no longer valid in response to HTTP request from the client user) [see Col. 7, Lines 1-40]

Regarding claim 23, Smith further teaches said URI is a first URI and said generating said search engine request includes generating a second URI having a query component (i.e., first URL is valid and accessible while the content of first URL is not available then redirect mechanism will lead to second valid URL where the content is accessible) [see Col. 13, Line 25 to Col. 14, Line 7 and Col. 15, Lines 24-60].

Regarding claim 24, Smith and Ong do not explicitly teach string length of said first URI is smaller in size than string length of said second URI. However, it would have been obvious to one of person skilled in the art to implement one URI string shorter than the other because it makes sense when the first URI includes only non-query component while the second URI includes both non-query component and query component.

Regarding claim 25, Smith further teaches providing at least one advertisement corresponding to said at least one keyword before said providing said results of said search engine request (i.e., updating the URL link before processing query for displaying the new page) [see Fig. 4 and Col. 15, Lines 23-60].

Regarding claims 26-28, Smith further teaches said URI is the minimum form "scheme://SLD.TLD/FLD?index.htm" whereby SLD.TLD is a domain name, FLD is a first level directory path, and index.htm is a default file and creating said FLD and said default file when it is determined that said file cannot be located on said server and corresponding said default file to said results of said search engine request (i.e., scheme = protocol type, host = domain name, path = default file) [see Figs. 9A-9B and Col. 3, Line 49 – Col. 4, Line 38 and Col. 12, Lines 18-56 and Col. 21, Lines 10-14].

Regarding claims 29-31, Smith further teaches said URI is of the minimum form "scheme://3LD.SLD.TLD/index.htm" whereby SLD.TLD is a domain name, 3LD is a sub-domain of said domain name, and index.htm is a default file and creating said 3LD and said default file when it is determined that said file cannot be located on said server and corresponding said default file to said results of said engine request (i.e., scheme = protocol type, host = domain name and sub-domain, path = default file) [see Figs. 9A-9B and Col. 3, Line 49 – Col. 4, Line 38 and Col. 12, Lines 18-56 and Col. 21, Lines 10-14].

Regarding claims 32-23, Smith further teaches inputting said URI from a user interface element by inputting said URI into one of a browser location field, text box, command line, and speech to text interface (i.e., user browses a URL by typing in the URL) [see Col. 15, Lines 24-25].

Claims 34-36 are rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 21. In addition, Smith further teaches a processor (i.e., processing unit 122), a memory coupled to said processor (i.e., system memory 122) [see Fig. 6] and a browser type program (i.e., a web browser program) [see Abstract and Col. 6, Lines 12-32].

Regarding claim 37, Smith further teaches said at least one keyword from the valid first URI and said query component of said valid second URI is at least one of a scheme, domain identifier, port, and path (i.e., scheme = protocol type, host = domain name, port, path) [see Figs. 9A-9B and Col. 3, Line 49 – Col. 4, Line 38 and Col. 12, Lines 18-56 and Col. 21, Lines 10-14].

Claims 38-39 are rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claims 32-33.

Regarding claim 40, Smith does not explicitly teach at least one keyword is a non-query URI component of the valid first URI. However, Ong, in the same field of locating resource on the Internet by processing Uniform Resource Locator (URL),

discloses extracting the time-stamp (keyword), retrieving the appropriate Web page corresponding to the time-stamp and returning appropriate page to the client [see Abstract and Paragraph [0008] on Page 1]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate implementation of extracting keyword from URL and generating a search engine request to search web page content from corresponding keyword and providing results of search engine request, disclosed by Ong, into the system of searching resource on the Internet using URL request disclosed by Smith, for the same reason set forth above to claim 36 or 1.

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 21-40 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

4. A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS, OR THIRTY DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. FAILURE TO RESPOND WITHIN THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE WILL CAUSE THE APPLICATION TO BECOME ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). EXTENSIONS OF TIME MAY BE OBTAINED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF 37 CAR 1.136(A).

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip Tran whose telephone number is (703) 308-8767.

The Group fax phone number is (703) 872-9306.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T. Alam, can be reached on (703) 308-6662.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Philip Tran
Philip B. Tran
Art Unit 2155
July 23, 2004